

Mass observing the atom bomb: the emotional politics of August 1945

Article (Accepted Version)

Langhamer, Claire (2018) Mass observing the atom bomb: the emotional politics of August 1945. Contemporary British History. ISSN 1361-9462

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/73681/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Mass Observing the Atom Bomb: the emotional politics of August 1945.

Claire Langhamer
Department of History
University of Sussex
Brighton
BN1 9QN

01273 678320

c.l.langhamer@sussex.ac.uk

Abstract:

In August 1945 the social investigative organisation, Mass-Observation, asked its panel of volunteer writers to 'Describe in detail your own feelings and views about the atom bomb, and those of the people you meet.' This article uses the responses to explore the emotional politics of 'nuclearity' in the immediate aftermath of the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. First it examines the impact that the atomic explosions had upon ways of narrating, and managing, the emotional self. Second it explores the influence of nuclear knowledge on felt social relations. The article argues that first use of the atom bomb had a profound impact upon British people's understandings of the past, the present and the political future; and that the responses of ordinary people in turn helped to shape a messy and contradictory popular nuclear culture within which feeling operated as a way of knowing, and intervening in, the world.

Keywords:

Mass Observation; Emotion; Nuclearity; Britain; 1945

Acknowledgements:

Mass Observation material is used by permission of the Trustees of the Mass Observation Archive, University of Sussex.

Mass Observing the Atom Bomb: the emotional politics of 'nuclearity'.

Claire Langhamer

Introduction

On 1st September 1945, a 32 year-old housewife composed her thoughts on the latest questionnaire sent to her by the British social investigative organisation, Mass-Observation. The 'Directive' for August 1945 posed a series of questions on the peace in Europe and on the new Labour government.¹ That the volunteer writers who received this directive were expected to detail their emotions, as well as their opinions and experiences, was established from the outset. The first question asked that they 'Describe in detail your own feelings and views about the atom bomb, and those of the people you meet'.²

In writing her *own feelings* about the atom bomb, this particular woman was mindful of recent events in her life – she had just given birth to a daughter. We see the complex interplay of past experience, present feeling and future thinking in her response. We can also identify a personal, notably visceral, emotional politics of 'nuclearity':³

My feelings about the Atom bomb? Hard to describe – a sort of primal shudder and at once the thought "then if this can happen what is the good of anything?" I see the earth like an ant-heap about to be crushed by a field-boot – casually, just like that – and I can neither deflect the blow nor warn the ants. I know I am one of them but I feel detached from it all though I feel my children cannot escape annihilation, and understand for the first time the mothers who poisoned their children in the face of the enemy advance...My feelings are so overwhelming that I have no views – whatever we think about who should handle the thing and who should not be admitted to the fellowship it is only a matter of time until some damn fool goes too far. As sensible to trust men of today – or of any day – with such power as to leave a baby alone with a man-eating tiger. We

shall destroy ourselves entirely...I can't talk about it – so I have no friends views to add. I am afraid. I AM AFRAID. And where will it get me? We are impotent.⁴

The emotional power of this response was not out of place amongst replies to the August Directive. While the dropping of the atomic bomb on two Japanese cities provoked diverse feelings amongst Mass-Observation's volunteer panel of writers, few denied the historical and personal significance of these final acts of the Second World War. Regardless of whether they vehemently opposed the action, actively supported it, or inhabited a position of moral and strategic uncertainty, the Mass-Observers believed that the world had changed decisively; or more precisely they *felt* they had entered a new 'atomic age'.

In recent years historians have sought to move nuclear history beyond a 'top-down' focus on personalities and high politics.⁵ Opening up, and problematizing, concepts such as 'nuclear culture' and 'nuclearity', scholars increasingly engage with the broader themes of postwar social, cultural and political history. Some – including contributors to this special issue – have taken the so-called 'emotional turn', responding in part to Joseph Masco's declaration that 'Reclaiming the emotional history of the atomic bomb is crucial today'.⁶ Masco has used mass circulation images of nuclear damage in the United States to explore 'the affective coordinates of the nuclear security state', showing how citizens were emotionally managed through 'civil defence' programmes which sought to transform paralysing nuclear terror into productive nuclear fear.⁷ The goal, he argues, was 'The microregulation of a nation community at the emotional level.'⁸ And yet, as Frank Beiss shows for West Germany, state attempts to manage nuclear fear could have unforeseen outcomes: 'The perception and articulation of popular fears regarding civil defence stood in uneasy tension with the dominant emotional regime in West Germany and ultimately helped to transform it.'⁹ This sense of emotion as a driver of nuclear change is further developed by Friederike Brühöfener in her study of the West German Peace

Movement: 'Articulating "my fear of nuclear war" was not only the expression of a person's immediate feelings – it could also function as a useful method to foreground the individual as an important political factor.'¹⁰ Brühöfener identifies this as a late twentieth century phenomenon rooted in the social psychological currents of the 1970s, but I will suggest that we see it in an earlier period too.¹¹

Building on these approaches, and on Jonathan Hogg's work on 'nuclear anxiety' in Britain, this article considers what the emotional politics of the atom bomb looked like in 1945.¹² It uses 'ordinary' – or at least non-elite – people's writing for Mass-Observation to explore first, the impact that the atomic explosions had upon ways of narrating, and managing, the emotional self, and second, the influence of nuclear knowledge on felt social relations.¹³ I will argue that use of the atom bomb by the United States had a profound impact upon British people's understandings of the past, the present and the political future; and that the responses of ordinary people in turn helped to shape a messy and contradictory popular nuclear culture within which feeling operated as a way of knowing, and intervening in, the world.

As is well known, Mass-Observation recruited paid and unpaid observers to conduct 'anthropology of ourselves...a scientific study of human social behaviour.'¹⁴ Its methods included the solicitation of diaries, received from 474 people across the mid-century period, the discursive questionnaires the organisation referred to as Directives, essay competitions, social surveys, and various other ethnographic practices.¹⁵ A consistent, and perhaps surprising, interest in feeling is evident across all of these research practices. Mass-Observation sought out individual and collective feeling – rarely 'emotion' – not as a proxy for attitude, but as something of interest in its own right. As its then Director – Bob Willcock – put it in 1942, 'Mass-Observation is particularly concerned with people's behaviour, their subjective feelings, their worries, frustrations, hopes, desires, expectations and fears.'¹⁶ This interest was notably apparent in the Directives sent to its 'National Panel' of volunteer writers. Feeling-requests were an important element within these texts and the word

'feel' or 'feelings' was sometimes underlined to emphasise the specificity of what was required. These questions were often rooted in the themes of everyday life; they could also spin around the experience of particular emotions such as fear and hope. In October 1942, for example, the panellists were asked 'What are your main personal fears now? Divide your answer into a) Present everyday fears and b) Fears about the future. At other times the questions were wilfully open-ended: 'How do you feel about 1944?'¹⁷

Mass-Observation's interest in its panel's feelings was not, however, restricted to the realm of the 'personal' or everyday. Feeling was also mobilised as a research category when enquiring about current and future world affairs; and in ways that actively blurred the boundaries between the personal, the national, the international and the political. Mass-Observation was an early measurer of civilian morale and of what it termed 'mass-mentality and mass reaction.'¹⁸ In a 1940 publication, *War Begins at Home*, Tom Harrisson and Charles Madge noted that 'For the civilian, war is above all a process of anxiety' suggesting that:

In order to conduct a war thoroughly, we must then turn certain passive feelings into active feelings, and externalise violent hatreds which are ordinarily turned inwards within civilised individuals in this country. Similarly, personal, private ethics and desires have to be transformed, elevated and merged into a general pattern of the whole community. The private interest has to become the public interest.¹⁹

If Mass-Observation was not sure – at least initially – what morale actually was, this did not stop it engaging in an expansive programme of data collection.²⁰ As Dibley and Kelly have more recently suggested, Mass-Observation did, in fact, play a significant role both in establishing morale as an area of research and in suggesting strategies through which the state might manage it.²¹

But Mass-Observation's interest in the national mood was not limited to the immediate concerns of everyday home front life. Feelings about the world were regularly solicited. Panellists were asked to compose their feelings about India

(August 1942 and May 1943), the bombing of Germany (December 1943) and about the situation in Greece (December 1944-January 1945).²² In February 1942 they were asked to reflect on their 'present feelings' about the British Empire: 'Have they changed since war began?' Here, as elsewhere, individual Mass-Observers were asked to reflect on the processes through which their feelings – and sometimes, other people's feelings - had changed over time.

The material generated by Mass-Observation provides ways of getting at individual emotional expression within a self-consciously collective wartime context. The self-declared motivations of those who wrote for it included creativity, self-improvement, historical-mindedness and curiosity. A belief that wartime writing for the organisation was a form of active citizenship drove the involvement of some and Mass-Observation encouraged this perspective. Writing to its volunteer writers in May 1940 it declared that 'the increased tension of the war ought to make the whole of M-O more determined than ever to carry on its work, because we believe that it is important work and that we should be inconsistent and unscientific if we gave it up just because there's a war on.'²³ In August of the same year the panel was reassured that 'The stuff that observers have been sending in is quite definitely going to prove of first class importance when the time comes to write a history of this war.'²⁴

Writing for Mass Observation was, then, an act of citizenship with future, as well as present, significance. Encouraged by a distinctive mode of questioning, writing for Mass-Observation was also an avowedly emotional citizenship practice.²⁵ Indeed Mass-Observers might be understood as members of a loose 'emotional community' to use Barbara Rosenwein's much deployed formulation, or to borrow from Benno Gammerl, they might be seen as manifesting particular 'emotional styles' within a specific emotional space.²⁶ Their writing also demonstrates what Sara Ahmed terms, the 'sociality of emotion'.²⁷

The wartime directives have been used by a number of historians for varied purposes. Both Jennifer Purcell and James Hinton - with different emphases - have used them biographically, in tandem with diary material, to reconstruct the

mid-century lives of individual Mass-Observers.²⁸ Others have approached them more thematically as a lens through which to explore attitudes towards 'race' and ethnicity, love and sex, and gender and national identity.²⁹ The two approaches can, of course, be combined. A substantial core of volunteers maintained their relationship with Mass-Observation across the war years, and they were not infrequently asked repeat questions over time. The Directives therefore offer a unique longitudinal autobiographical data source allowing for the charting of the changing views of individuals on specific topics over time. They also facilitate the contextualisation of one specific response through recourse to the writer's other contributions. The woman cited at the beginning of this article was not the most prolific of Mass-Observers, but she nonetheless responded to Directives in January and February 1939, April 1944, January, August and November 1945 and submitted an extensive diary entry in May 1944.³⁰

Here, however, I want to use the Directive material as 'a sort of documentary cross-section' rather than as a way of reconstructing individual lives or even individual attitudes across time.³¹ 178 members of the panel answered the Directive of August 1945: 85 of these were women and 93 were men. The numbers responding to Mass Observation's questionnaires fluctuated sharply across the war. For example, in May 1942 there were 496 responses but numbers declined in 1945 and only once in that year did they exceed the 200 mark.³² In its early stages younger men dominated the panel, but by 1945 it was more representative of the age and gender, if not social class, distribution of the population more broadly.³³ I approach their responses as offering a snapshot view - a slice of feeling - in order to interrogate the emotional complexity of a particular moment in time. The article explores feelings about the atom bomb in the immediate aftermath of the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and assesses the epistemological resources that individuals drew upon in framing their responses to these cataclysmic world events. Fundamentally I ask what knowledge of the atom bomb felt like to those who wrote to Mass-Observation in 1945; a moment when nuclear anxiety was not yet part of the fabric of everyday life, even if a 'nuclear imagination' was already established.³⁴ It was, in fact, a

moment when individuals were thrown upon their own resources to actively work out for themselves what 'nuclearity' might mean for themselves and for the world.

Writing Feeling

Historians of modern Britain have become increasingly interested in the management of wartime feeling. Amy Bell has explored the 'repressed fears and dark emotions' that haunted those who endured the London blitz, demonstrating that both the control *and* the expression of feeling characterised wartime citizenship.³⁵ Lucy Noakes identifies restrained self-management as the expected wartime response to bereavement and yet notes that 'an emotional reticence should not be read as evidence that grief was not deeply felt.'³⁶ Charting the social and political work of mid-century psychoanalysis, Michal Shapira argues that 'Total war, waged against civilians as much as soldiers incited advanced discussions about emotional and mental well-being' while James Hinton suggests that total war also encouraged individuals to interrogate 'the meaning of their own lives.'³⁷ William Reddy has argued that periods of crisis effect transformations in emotional style.³⁸ The dropping of the atom bomb in August 1945 appears to have been one such moment.

Those who wrote their feelings about the atom bomb were, as we have seen, well versed in offering an emotional response; many chose a narrativized form, writing in detail about where and how they heard the news. 'When I heard the news on the wireless one night I think I was as horrified as if this had happened to an allied city; the sheer enormity of the thing was chilling' wrote a 34 year-old farm worker.³⁹ A woman serving in the WAAF 'first heard about the atomic bomb on the nine o'clock news in a Bournemouth hotel. The lounge was full of old ladies and retired Indian army colonels, which made it seem even more unreal...'⁴⁰ The context of first knowledge was emphasised within these structured accounts; so too was the physicality of the initial response. Mass-Observation's language of 'feeling', rather than 'emotion', encouraged responses that transcended any distinction between cognition and embodiment.⁴¹ For this

group of writers – men and women alike – consideration of their own embodied reaction offered an initial way of reflecting on events that defied easy conceptualisation. A teacher recorded that she ‘felt sick at heart that a civilised nation could use such a weapon. My sister and I heard it while at breakfast, we looked at each other, I could see her face quite white.’⁴² A writer recalled ‘a sinking (or should I say a “shrinking”?) feeling inside me.’⁴³ A London social worker simply stated that ‘The idea of the atomic bomb gives me the “creeps”.’⁴⁴ As Joanna Bourke reminds us, ‘The emotion of fear is fundamentally about the body – its fleshiness and its precariousness.’⁴⁵

In writing their feelings about the atom bomb, Mass-Observers frequently deployed a narrative of emotional reappraisal, reflecting on shifts in their response over time and according to a fast changing context. This should not surprise us. Mass-Observation had long encouraged its volunteer writers to be reflexive in their self-narration: a question from the May-June 1945 Directive had asked, for example, ‘How do you feel now the war’s over in Europe, and how does this compare with how you expected to feel?’⁴⁶ Individuals recorded their journey through various stages of horror, fear, awe, jubilation, and pity; others expressed ‘relief’, and some even felt curious. Above all, feelings were messy and difficult to pin down: ‘wonder, anticipation, fear all blend in the spontaneous emotion.’⁴⁷ The cultural theorist Sara Ahmed has suggested that ‘Messiness is a good starting point for thinking with feelings: ...they often come at us, surprise us, leaving us cautious and bewildered.’⁴⁸ Her twenty first century description has particular traction within the 1945 context as individuals were faced with events that they struggled to process.

Mass-Observers reported shifting responses over the days and weeks following the explosions. This could make it tricky for them to ‘feel’ their initial feelings. A soldier recorded that ‘First feelings of people I met were of horror and fear. So much has happened since that I’m afraid the first wave of feeling has been overlaid...’⁴⁹ For some the passage of time brought clarification and greater hopefulness. A Glasgow secretary explained her own journey from consternation through rejoicing to hope:

My first reaction to the atomic bomb was one of complete consternation – a feeling of having lost any sense of security at all, that within a few years we would all be killed and mankind would vanish from the face of the earth. At the same time I had a slight feeling of rejoicing that this must surely bring the end of the Japanese war very soon, but this was a very minor triumph compared with the staggering effect of the news. Then gradually I began to hope that the atomic bomb would mean the end of all wars, that no nation would ever have the stupidity to risk war that would mean complete extinction...⁵⁰

For others, feelings evaded clarification or shifted back and forth between extremes of fear and hope. Feelings of horror increased, as the after effects of the atomic blasts became widely known. A civil servant was particularly reflexive in her consideration of the development of her feelings and views:

My first feelings about the atom bomb were of utter horror combined with fear – horror at the ghastly effects – even as first described – and also that we should use this awful weapon. Fear that the war was at last entering on the phase anticipated at its beginning, - of utter destruction of all civilisation and mutual extermination. Fear, that even if this worst did not happen, the disintegration started by the bomb would spread and spread uncontrollably until it eventually engulfed the whole world. Statements made in the next few days were reassuring on this last point, as it was said that the effects were not spreading or continuing; and of course events have proved the first fear unjustified.

After this initial stage of horror and fear - according to her narrative - she found herself reassured by allied claims that the bomb had ultimately saved both allied and Japanese lives by shortening the war. And yet this feeling of surety did not last:

...the last few days reports rather over rule this reassurance. In the first place the story of the first reporters to enter Hiroshima - of the poisonous air and of people dying now who seem to have been an injured, show that the effects of the bomb do continue - perhaps indefinitely - long after the original explosion and who can say how they will spread. Secondly reports now show that the Japanese "were at the end of their tether" - so it would appear that the use of the bomb did not shorten the war to such an extent as we suppose... it has marred the joy of victory and made it almost impossible to give thanks in sincerity to God for victory and peace because they have been claimed by what seems more like a gift from the devil than from God.⁵¹

While some Mass-Observers attended to the shifting texture of their emotional response, others considered the broader possibilities and utility of feeling, or sought to distinguish between what they felt and what they thought, as Mass-Observation's question had indicated that they should. A Sussex teacher made a sharp distinction between the two forms of response: 'I feel disgust, I think it was right to use our maximum means against the enemy and finish the war quickly.'⁵² Others spoke to the longer term impact of war on their emotional register: 'Horror and fear have limits and we've long ago reached them' wrote one woman, 'I only feel cold about the atom bomb'⁵³. A sergeant in the Royal Air Force whose 'most conscious feeling about the atomic bomb is one of resignation', admitted that 'war has stunted much tenderness'⁵⁴ while a former Royal Navy Volunteer Reservist noted that, 'Feelings - either I have few, or the only feeling I have is relief that it ended the war.'⁵⁵ Some actively rejected the utility of an emotional response to the atom bomb: 'We have to be very careful when assessing any scientific achievement in not getting emotional about it.'⁵⁶ As I have argued elsewhere, the relationship between 'reason' and 'emotion', or at least constructions of these, became a matter for debate within postwar British politics - 'emotion' was castigated by politicians and the press as an inferior and implicitly feminine way of knowing.⁵⁷ And yet amongst Mass Observers writing in of 1945, the emotional response was only infrequently rejected.

Some of the correspondents reflected on the epistemological materials upon which their response drew. 'You ask me for my feelings and views, as well as those of the people I meet', wrote one, 'The following are a few random notes, by no means a considered opinion, but reflecting partly what I have read, partly what I have heard from others, and to a small degree my own original thoughts.'⁵⁸ Mass-Observation had long encouraged such reflection, periodically asking their volunteer writers the same set of questions on opinion formation. Panellists were asked to rank twelve factors influencing their 'activities and opinion', including books, newspapers and personal experience – each of which was consistently highly ranked.⁵⁹ The value of experience as the basis for knowledge claims rose particularly dramatically over the course of the war: from fifth place amongst the ranked factors in 1940 to first place when the questions were asked in September 1946.⁶⁰

Indeed the panellists drew upon their own experience and knowledge of warfare in crafting their responses to the atom bomb. The poison gas of the First World War was one such point of reference: 'I don't believe that this bomb will frighten people out of war; the ghastly tales of poison gas didn't do so...', despaired a 65 year-old man.⁶¹ Others drew upon their own experiences of aerial bombing to try to make sense of this new form of warfare, suggesting that the atom bomb was a more merciful – because, they claimed, speedier – way to die. 'They at least would be spared the fear of wondering and of hearing the noise. Most people are more worried by the noise of near misses than anything and here the actual victims would be spared this, and one could imagine death was instantaneous', claimed a chartered electrical engineer.⁶² A Kent housewife suggested that 'perhaps it is a good thing because now war will be different, shorter, and one will be snuffed out quickly; there will probably be no forces, thus saving much waste of time and money. No long endurance of years of raids, terror and blackout.'⁶³ Those who crafted their responses later in September, as the on-going effects of the atom bomb became apparent, were less likely to advance this position.

As well as marshalling their own experiences, Mass-Observers referenced cultural resources in writing their feelings about the atom bomb. Jeff Hughes has rightly pointed to the 'diversity of cultures of the nuclear' but here I am interested in the resources that individual Mass Observers explicitly cited.⁶⁴ The press was a target of particular criticism; portrayed as a source of anxiety or as a mouthpiece of scientists. 'Newspapers [are] to blame for general alarm' declared one woman.⁶⁵ Another claimed that 'opinion is led by the newspapers, and particularly by articles by scientists, to an amazing extent.'⁶⁶ Some preferred to ignore newspaper coverage entirely - 'I like others didn't read or even scan *Picture Post* last week to avoid the subject' wrote one man.⁶⁷ Science fiction writing apparently offered more useful scripts and terminology. A clerk in the RAF wrote that:

My personal feeling as soon as I heard the first bomb was "Well! That's the end of it!" – and a sense of relief that the Jap war had finished months ahead of expectations. At the same instant I recollected reading a story in an American magazine a long time ago, describing the end of the war being brought about by a powerful bomb, and thought that once more fiction had become fact!⁶⁸

Atomic weapons were deployed by a number of science fiction writers from the late nineteenth century onwards, but it was the work of H. G. Wells that Mass Observers most often referenced.⁶⁹ A woman in the forces explained that:

In November 1940 I read a book by H G Wells, in which he described an atom bomb raid on Paris. The description was vivid – how the earth was churned to black liquid, how the devastated city glowed red with flames. I shuddered with horror to think that the Luftwaffe raids experienced at the time could ever be so horrible. Then I was comforted, thinking to myself that such bombs would never be invented in my lifetime: when the news of the first atom bomb raid on Japan was announced, my first thoughts were off the gory description in that book by HG Wells. I was

again shaken with horror. Such bombs had been invented in my lifetime!⁷⁰

The concept of a 'Wellsian nightmare', or 'Wellsian affair', had popular purchase.⁷¹ As a government draftswoman put it: 'we were being whirled into a Wellsian future against our will. I always believed in a Wellsian future, but I never expected to be in on it and have never had any wish to be.'⁷² In fact as a 20 year-old secretary put it, 'the possibilities surpassed anything H. G. Wells ever wrote.'⁷³

The Sociality of Feeling

In crafting their responses to the atom bomb, Mass-Observers actively constructed distinct, although sometimes overlapping, emotional communities that span around their own particular position.⁷⁴ These self-made communities demonstrate the 'sociality of feeling' and the ways in which feeling tied the individual to the world. As Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta argue, 'Emotions are part of the "stuff" connecting human beings to each other and the world around them, like the unseen lens that colours all our thoughts, actions, perceptions and judgements.'⁷⁵

Most panellists claimed that their own views were widely shared across place, and space. Indeed this assertion provided evidence for the veracity of their position. 'Above all I have noticed how unanimous people are in their feelings about the atom bomb' wrote a 20 year-old, 'Everyone thinks it is terrible – but beyond that they don't quite know what to feel.'⁷⁶ A 17 year-old shorthand typist who thought it 'frightful' and 'quite shocking', stated that 'All the people with whom I have discussed the atomic bomb seem to feel pretty much the same as I, about it.'⁷⁷ Those who supported its use similarly cited the ubiquity of their view. 'I don't look on it as any different from an ordinary bomb except that it is more to be feared because of its greater power. I'd say this is how most folks look at it just as a bigger and better bomb', wrote a man in his thirties.⁷⁸ A farmer's wife whose bomb enthusiasm stemmed from her belief that it had shortened the war,

claimed that 'the simple folk around here seem to take more or less a like view. I have not heard the other line expressed at all.'⁷⁹

There were, nonetheless, a minority of Mass-Observers who saw themselves as sitting outside of any community of feeling - who felt isolated and emotionally 'out of place' and at the jagged edges of shared feeling. An aero-examiner living in Newport, for example, recorded that 'the people I meet don't seem the least perturbed, they are daft or I am barmy - an immediate world round table conference seems imperative to me.'⁸⁰ In fact it was those that supported use of the bomb - women as well as men, writing from diverse locations - who were more likely to paint themselves as outsiders.⁸¹ An army vicar admitted to being 'rather shocked at the amount of "Sob-stuff" I am hearing from people about the bomb and atomic energy as a whole. People, at least 75% of those with whom I've spoken, are muddle headed or cowards or both.'⁸²

Beyond this positioning of the self in relation to the collective, the sociality of feeling - and its boundaries - was apparent in writing about specific categories of other people; notably so in relation to other nations. After years of wartime mobilisation, the national 'we' wielded significant discursive power. 'Generally speaking the view seems to be 'It's a damn bad thing but thank God we got it first!' noted one man.'⁸³ A teacher recorded that 'Nearly everyone expressed horror and fear, but thought the A Bomb was justifiable, because Germans were trying to make it to use against us,' while a secretary felt 'positive that if the Japanese had had the atom bomb first, they would have used it to exterminate white races. If Germans had had it they would have exterminated Britons, and used the other European nationals as slave races.'⁸⁴

For some writers national feelings - and the wartime processes through which they had been fermented - framed their responses to those killed in the attacks. One man admitted that he 'could not feel any pity or sorrow for the Japanese dead and dying, partly because of the imperceptible hardening of my perceptsives [sic] by the cumulative horrors of war, and also because distance deadens feeling.'⁸⁵ While one Mass-Observers was sure that 'no one said 'they deserved it',

some of his fellow Mass-Observers actually did.⁸⁶ A housewife suggested that 'we didn't drop enough and it's a thousand pities that Germany caved in too soon.'⁸⁷ An electrical engineer living in Blackburn reported that 'the general opinion of the people I have met is that we should have dropped more of them on Japan. Very few stated why or what would have been gained other than wiping out the Japanese.'⁸⁸

Others, however, expressed a sense of shame and likened the attacks to Nazi atrocities. For a young agricultural worker 'its indiscriminate use on the two Japanese towns proves that for barbarism the Nazis "have nothing on us".'⁸⁹ A head teacher concurred, 'My own attitude is clear: I cannot think of any definition of "atrocious" or of "war criminal" which rules out this bomb and the people who gave orders for its use (including Churchill and Truman and the pilots who dropped them).'⁹⁰ Mass-Observers articulated powerful emotional responses that spoke to transnational emotional ties. A London teacher, for example, confided that 'Even at the time of the announcement I began to feel that I should not be able to lift up my head in the presence of a Japanese.'⁹¹ Objections to the bombing of densely populated areas without warning, and condemnation of the second bombing, were widespread.⁹² One of the most prolific of female Mass-Observers admitted that she was:

Too horrified to want to think or speak of it and yet it is seldom out of my mind. It casts a gloom over everything and its horrifying possibilities make nothing worth while doing. As few people speak to me about it, and as those who do only express horror briefly, I think most of my friends feel the same. My next door neighbour wrote to the local paper and said that after the elimination camps in Germany the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were the most horrible acts ever perpetrated by man.⁹³

Even as early as the summer of August 1945 individuals were, then, trying to weigh up the moral equivalence of acts of war.

They were beginning to weigh international relations in a postwar world too, increasingly unsure as to whom Britain's future allies and enemies would be. Global anxieties focused upon knowledge of the atomic secret. There was a clear distrust of the United States, exacerbated by the ending of the lend-lease programme: 'they may use it against Britain and do us another dirty trick', wrote one Mass Observer.⁹⁴ There was also 'some annoyance that although a British invention it had to be made in America and dropped by an American plane.' Acknowledging the contingency of his feelings on the subject, this writer added that 'The debt settlement seems to have affected my feelings towards the US.'⁹⁵ A number of people advocated sharing atomic knowledge with the Russians or with the Council of the United Nations in an effort to foster world peace and dilute the global power of the United States.

If former allies could not necessarily be trusted then nor too could scientists. While the status of the scientist-expert was complex, scientific discovery provoked more fear than optimism. 'The ingenuity of science is wonderful and admirable' admitted a Norwich-based schoolteacher, 'that it should be directed to such ends is worse than prostitution and a kind of blasphemy.'⁹⁶ According to a particularly animated Mass-Observer, 'the "scientists" who told us there was no God, and then sold their great intelligence to the highest military bidders, should have been blown up with their own devilish invention.'⁹⁷ Others argued that science should be harnessed for more positive purposes, writing from a subject position of 'ordinariness' that wielded considerable affective and political power coming out of a 'peoples war'.⁹⁸ A coal miner asked why science was 'so horribly successful in weapons of destruction' but had not yet cured the common cold or cancer: 'I am only an ordinary man, but if I can see such a misdirection of scientific research, surely those who have been trained and educated to view these problems with a keener intellect than I can see it.'⁹⁹

A minority stood in defence of science sometimes invoking a dichotomy between 'reason' and 'emotion' to do so. One young man asserted that the popular response had confirmed a feeling 'that people are emotionally afraid of science: afraid, because it is a product of the brain, and their own brains are not trained

to minimise the emotional aspect in favour of an outlook that would enable them.’¹⁰⁰ A Sussex teacher railed against what she perceived to be widespread hypocrisy: ‘I despise the attitude of mind which shouts against ‘scientists’ – no doubt while opening a tin of meat from the other side of the world, or using some other of the million and one products of science and without any intention of foregoing them.’¹⁰¹ Some went further in their defence. A member of the WAAF reported on an operation room cartoon drawn by one of the pilots. Entitled ‘Public Hero No 1. 1945 type’ it apparently depicted ‘a Professor (holding up a test-tube) with a huge brain, and decorated with an enormous ‘gong’.’¹⁰²

The scientist/non-scientist cleavage was not the only fracture in the imagined community of feeling. Mass Observers also cited gender, occupation and religiosity as important delineators of feeling and perspective. A Brighton woman wrote that ‘all war in future will be so terrible. I do wish that all the nations would resolve never to have another!. Perhaps when women have more power, this happy state of things will come to pass!’¹⁰³ A housewife asserted that ‘Women – ordinary ones I mean – are life givers – not destroyers. Any bombs therefore are deplorable, even if in the world of today a necessity.’¹⁰⁴ Both suggest a link between masculinity and militarism; an association that would again be voiced in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament marches of the late 1950s and at Greenham Common in the 1980s.¹⁰⁵ There was certainly a perception amongst some male Mass Observers that reaction to the atom bomb was gendered and that women were more likely to exhibit an ‘emotional’ response to the subject. Analysis of the panel responses as a whole suggests that this was not actually the case. Mass Observation had explicitly requested that its panellists narrate their feelings on the topic and men, as well as women, responded in emotional terms.

A cleavage was, however, identified between civilian and service responses:

Service chaps to whom I speak and correspond think the bomb wasn’t used enough on Japan. No one has the slightest sympathy for the dirty little yellow creatures and everyone feels we shouldn’t be getting that so-

called “loss of face” attitude there even if we’d killed off a few more...The civilian attitude however, seems altogether different. Civvies appear to be under the impression that use of the bomb is inhumane and don't take into consideration the fact that at least quarter of a million lives have been saved. Casualties would have been extremely heavy in the invasion of Japan and after all, it is allied soldiers lives we’re worried about. No one should care a twopenny cuss whether 200,000 Japs have been killed so long as our own chap’s lives are saved. I’ve seen enough young, intelligent and decent chaps killed on the battlefield and I don't want to see or hear any more.¹⁰⁶

Here we see a sharp distinction drawn between the armed forces and those at home; a weighing up of the relative value of life; explicitly racist attitudes towards the Japanese people and, ultimately, the use of lived experience as an evidential base. A 29 year-old shared some of these sentiments admitting that ‘my feelings, as a soldier, are purely relief. It means that thousands of good men’s lives, perhaps including my own have been spared’, so too did a Bradford housewife who explained that ‘my son’s life is infinitely more precious to me than those of a million Japs.’¹⁰⁷

Perhaps the most significant dividing line - and the one that generated the strongest feelings of inclusion and exclusion – concerned broad questions of morality. Such questions haunted almost all of the responses even where they were not explicitly addressed. Was the atom bomb morally different to other weapons? Was the targeting of civilians justified if it had indeed hastened the end of the war? What were, in fact, the ethical parameters within which Total War could be conducted and what role should the churches take in mapping those parameters. According to a Leicester music teacher:

Of the people I meet I find that the intensely religious ones are definitely against the use of the atom bomb as they are also against all scientific inventions used against us by our enemies. They seem to regard them as the special work of devils operating through human beings. The more

secular and usually broader minded people take into consideration the fact that the atom bomb, by shortening the war, saved the lives of hundreds of our men.¹⁰⁸

In contrast one young woman believed that as a result of the action, 'Britain and America now have no right to call themselves Christian or civilised. They have no right to condemn the SS of Belsen'; other Mass-Observers also deployed Christianity as a tool of condemnation.¹⁰⁹ But in the heightened emotional climate of 1945, the public pronouncements of church leaders could provoke strong feelings too.¹¹⁰ A science teacher had 'no patience with those clerics and others who protest against its use while condoning the use of other bombs. They should have protested earlier or not at all', whilst a particularly frustrated Mass-Observers was

...irritated by the stupidity of the people who persisted in writing to the papers, saying it was an-Christian, and brutal, and like German methods. Total War has shown us that civilians are as much a military target as frontline soldiers, and since the Japanese at home are compelled to make munitions etc. they were not to be exempted from our attacks.¹¹¹

Conclusion

The Mass-Observers who replied to the August 1945 Directive believed themselves to have entered a new age. It was a moment of such significance that some struggled to articulate their feelings. As one man put it, 'I have often wondered what it was like to live at one of the turning points of man's evolution; now I have experienced it I wish I could capture in words the emotion that has pervaded me as a result of the BBC announcers calm announcement.'¹¹² Others engaged with the new world at some length. A soldier sent Mass-Observation a personal 'manifesto' entitled 'New World or No World?' in which he argued that:

Rightly developed, for the people and by the people, atomic energy can become the people's prize; the prize for which they have worked and

suffered and died so often. In the hands of the people of the world, it can clothe them, feed them, give them shelter; it can enable the resources of this globe – indeed, of the whole universe – to be harnessed and utilised for their benefit; it can bring us all in our lifetime undreamt-of wonders and treasures; it can make the world not only safe for our children, but a veritable paradise in life.

The use of a ‘people’s war’ rhetoric here is striking, as is the commitment to a truly global ‘people’s peace’. And there certainly *were* Mass-Observers who approached the atomic age with hope and optimism, envisaging a world without warfare, with enhanced international cooperation and worldwide prosperity.

However the majority of correspondents were less optimistic about the future, providing a first glimpse of the nuclear anxiety that would haunt British lives over subsequent decades. A 46 year-old housewife recorded that ‘I do not view the future use of atomic energy with any degree of enthusiasm – I hope to be dead by then anyway.’¹¹³ In fact three out of five panellists told Mass Observation that they felt depressed about the peace.¹¹⁴ A significant proportion believed that world destruction was imminent – there were references to ‘world suicide’, and a ‘sword of Damocles hanging over civilisation’.¹¹⁵ An electrical engineer explained that ‘Most people we have talked to have had a feeling of dread, wondering if it is possible to control such a force for good and not for evil intent. This same feeling seems almost universal and applies to all classes. There is a fear that this is the end.’¹¹⁶ A farm worker put it more succinctly: ‘We are in for the Age of Fear.’¹¹⁷

Indeed when Mass-Observation published its study of *Peace and the Public* in 1947, it pointed to an overwhelming mood of pessimism about the future and a, sometimes paralyzing, fear of imminent war amongst those it surveyed.¹¹⁸ When it had interviewed a cross-section of Hammersmith residents in June 1946, seven out of every ten suggested that there would be another war within 25 years.¹¹⁹ As the *Newcastle Journal* explained, ‘Investigations by Mass-Observation during 1946 show that the war transformed Britain from a nation of wishful-thinkers

into one of pessimists, largely convinced of the inevitability of another conflict.’¹²⁰ According to Mass-Observation, the emotional culture of Britain had been transformed.

Underpinning this emotional shift lay knowledge of the atom bomb and its almost unimaginable destructive powers. ‘Nuclearity’ exercised an increasingly powerful influence upon the feelings and experiences of ‘ordinary’ British people in the years after 1945, as multiple nuclear narratives unfurled. Those who responded to Mass-Observation’s August 1945 Directive had fewer cultural scripts to draw upon, but the impact of the atom bomb on feelings about the present, and the future, was no less powerful. As one man put it: ‘I have three children and we have all along planned to have four. My wife revived the question: I hesitated and thought of the future in terms of the atom bomb.’¹²¹

¹ Mass Observation Archive (MOA) Directive, August 1945.

² Ibid.

³ Hogg defines ‘nuclearity’ as ‘a shifting set of assumptions held by individual citizens on the danger of nuclear technology, assumptions that were rooted firmly in context and which circulated in, and were shaped by, national discourse’. Hogg, ‘The family that feared tomorrow’, 535.

⁴ MOA Directive, August 1945, DR 1022.

⁵ See, for example, the special issue of *The British Journal for the History of Science* on ‘British Nuclear Culture’, 2012.

⁶ Masco, ‘Survival is your Business’, 387.

⁷ Ibid., 372, 368.

⁸ Ibid, 368.

⁹ Beiss, ‘Everybody has a Chance’, 218.

¹⁰ Brühöfener, ‘Politics of Emotions’, 103.

¹¹ Ibid., 102.

¹² Hogg, *British Nuclear Culture*.

¹³ James Hinton has suggested that ‘many of the panel members did not think of themselves as ‘ordinary’. They tended to see themselves as unusual people, distinguished by their desire to self-fashion their lives free from the conventions of their social milieu.’ Hinton, *The Mass Observers*, 374.

¹⁴ Madge and Harrison, *Mass-Observation*, 10.

¹⁵ For more on Mass-Observation’s research methods see Hinton, *The Mass-Observers*, 260-293. On Mass-Observation in its intellectual context see Hubble, *Mass Observation and Everyday Life*.

-
- ¹⁶ MOA, FR 1415, 21.
- ¹⁷ MOA, Directive, December 1943.
- ¹⁸ Harrison and Madge, *War Begins at Home*, v.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., 424.
- ²⁰ Beaven and Griffiths, 'The blitz, civilian morale and the city', 73.
- ²¹ Dibley and Kelly, 'Morale and Mass Observation'.
- ²² For an analysis of responses to this last Directive see Hassiotis, 'British Military Opinion.'
- ²³ MOA, Directive, May 1940.
- ²⁴ MOA, Directive, August 1940.
- ²⁵ On different models of citizenship see Grant, 'Historicizing Citizenship in Post-war Britain'. On citizenship during the war see Rose, *Which People's War*.
- ²⁶ Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*; Gammerl, 'Emotional Styles'.
- ²⁷ Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 9.
- ²⁸ Hinton, *Nine Wartime Lives*; Purcell, *Domestic Soldiers*.
- ²⁹ Kushner, *We Europeans?*; Rose, *Which People's War?*; Langhamer, *The English in Love*; Noakes, *War and the British*.
- ³⁰ MOA, Diary, D5389.
- ³¹ MOA, FR 2278A, 4.
- ³² Numbers taken from *Mass Observation Online*. In the years after 1945 the numbers participating in the project rose with a peak number of responses - 704 - reached in February 1949.
- ³³ Hinton, *The Mass-Observers*, 268-269.
- ³⁴ Hogg, *British Nuclear Culture*, 26.
- ³⁵ Bell, 'Landscapes of Fear', 154. See also Bell, *London Was Ours*.
- ³⁶ Noakes, 'Gender, Grief and Bereavement', 84.
- ³⁷ Shapira, *The War Inside*; Hinton, 'Middle-class socialism', 116-117.
- ³⁸ Reddy, 'Historical Research', 312.
- ³⁹ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 1093, male, born 1912.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., DR 1651, female, born 1909.
- ⁴¹ Hera Cook defines feeling as 'the subjective experience resulting from the combination of embodied emotions and cognitions.' Cook, 'From controlling Emotion to Expressing Feelings', 630.
- ⁴² MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 1313, female, born 1891.
- ⁴³ Ibid., DR 3479, male, born 1923.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., DR 1563, female, born 1898.
- ⁴⁵ Bourke, 'Fear and Anxiety', 123. See also Bourke, *Fear*.
- ⁴⁶ MOA, Directive, May-June 1945.
- ⁴⁷ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 3090, male, born 1911.
- ⁴⁸ Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 210.

-
- ⁴⁹ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 1680, male, born 1917.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., DR 3545, female, born 1917.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., DR 2675, female, born 1892.
- ⁵² Ibid., DR 1078, female, born 1900.
- ⁵³ Ibid., DR 1974, female, born 1904.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., DR 3630, male, born 1908.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., DR 2568, male, born 1903.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., DR 2684, male, born 1908.
- ⁵⁷ Langhamer, 'The Live Dynamic Whole', 420-421.
- ⁵⁸ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 1679, male, born 1890.
- ⁵⁹ MOA, FR 2250, 'Opinion Forming', May 1944.
- ⁶⁰ MOA, Directive, September 1946.
- ⁶¹ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 1098, male, born 1880.
- ⁶² Ibid., DR 1165, male, born 1906.
- ⁶³ Ibid., DR 2892, female, born 1893.
- ⁶⁴ Hughes, 'What is British nuclear culture?'
- ⁶⁵ MOA Directive, August 1945, DR 3368, female, born 1909.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., DR 3119, female, born 1924.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., DR 1345, male, born 1917. *Picture Post* dedicated a whole issue to the subject entitled 'Man Enters The Atom Age'. *Picture Post*, 25th August 1945. For a study of nuclear representations in *Picture Post* between August 1945 and June 1957 see Laucht, "Dawn – or Dusk?"
- ⁶⁸ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 2512, male, born 1907.
- ⁶⁹ Hogg, *British Nuclear Culture*, 34-37.
- ⁷⁰ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 3642, female, no date of birth given.
- ⁷¹ Ibid., DR 1061, female, born 1889; DR 3603, male, born 1916.
- ⁷² Ibid., DR 3669, female, born 1918.
- ⁷³ Ibid., DR 3119, female, born 1924.
- ⁷⁴ Rosenwein defines emotional communities as 'groups – usually but not always social groups – that have their own particular values, modes of feeling and ways to express those feelings.' Rosenwein, *Generations of Feeling*, 3.
- ⁷⁵ Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta, *Passionate Politics*, 10.
- ⁷⁶ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 3119, female, born 1924.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., DR 3454, female, born 1928.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid., DR 1393, male, born 1909.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid., DR 3371, female, born 1894.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid., DR 2697, male, born 1903.
- ⁸¹ Ibid., DR 1490, female, born 1914.
- ⁸² Ibid., DR 3187, male, born 1900.
- ⁸³ Ibid., DR 2512, male, born 1907.

-
- ⁸⁴ Ibid., DR 1313, female, born 1891; DR 3474, female, born 1898.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid., DR 3679, male, no date of birth given.
- ⁸⁶ Ibid., DR 1345, male, born 1917.
- ⁸⁷ Ibid., DR 2254, female, born 1901.
- ⁸⁸ Ibid., DR 2399, male, born 1901.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid., DR 3650, male, born 1921.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid., DR 2567, male, born 1893.
- ⁹¹ Ibid., DR 2984, female, born 1980.
- ⁹² Ibid., DR 1688, male, born 1911.
- ⁹³ Ibid., DR 1014, female, born 1885.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid., DR 3120, female, born 1869.
- ⁹⁵ Ibid., DR 3674, male, no date of birth given.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid., DR 2795, male, born 1914.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid., DR 3642, female, no date of birth given.
- ⁹⁸ I explore the affective and political power of the claim to be ordinary in “‘Who the hell are ordinary people?’ Ordinarity as a category of historical analysis’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 2018.
- ⁹⁹ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 1226, male, born 1893.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid., DR 3479, male, born 1923.
- ¹⁰¹ Ibid., DR 1078, female, born 1900.
- ¹⁰² Ibid., DR 1651, female, born 1909.
- ¹⁰³ Ibid., DR 2463, female, born 1890.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid., DR 1061, female, born 1889.
- ¹⁰⁵ See for example some of the interviews in *March to Aldermaston*. On Greenham Common see Roseneil, *Disarming Patriarchy*.
- ¹⁰⁶ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 2090, male, born 1923.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid., DR 2635, male, born 1916; DR 2903, female, born 1896.
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid., DR 3022, female, born 1904.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid., DR 3642, female, no date of birth given.
- ¹¹⁰ On letters to the press see Grant, *After the Bomb*, 14-17.
- ¹¹¹ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 2992, female, born 1913; DR 3683, male, no date of birth given.
- ¹¹² Ibid., DR 3090, male, born 1911.
- ¹¹³ Ibid., DR 3034, female, born 1899.
- ¹¹⁴ Mass-Observation, *Peace and the Public*, 9-10. The question, ‘How do you feel about the peace now?’ was the second question put to the panel in August 1945.
- ¹¹⁵ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 3636, male, born 1918; DR 3119, female, born 1924.
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid., DR 1165, male, born 1906.
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid., DR 1093, male, born 1912.

¹¹⁸ Mass-Observation, *Peace and the Public*

¹¹⁹ Ibid, 15.

¹²⁰ *Newcastle Journal*, 12th May 1947.

¹²¹ MOA, Directive, August 1945, DR 3054, male, no date of birth given.

Bibliography

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004, 2nd edition 2014.

Anderson, Lindsay, Karl Reisz and Chris Menges. *March to Aldermaston*. 1959.

Beaven, Brad, and John Griffiths. "The Blitz, Civilian Morale and the City: Mass-Observation and Working-class Culture in Britain, 1940-41." *Urban History* 26, no. 1 (1999): 71-88.

Beiss, Frank. "'Everybody has a Chance': Nuclear Angst, Civil Defence, and the History of Emotions in Postwar West Germany." *German History* 27, no. 2 (2009): 215-243.

Bell, Amy. "Landscapes of Fear: Wartime London, 1939-1945." *Journal of British Studies* 48, no. 1 (2009): 153-175.

Bell, Amy. *London Was Ours: Diaries and Memoirs of the London Blitz*. London: I B Tauris, 2007.

Bingham, Adrian. "'The monster'? The British Popular Press and Nuclear Culture, 1945-early 1960s." *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45, no. 4 (2012): 609-624.

Bourke, Joanna. "Fear and Anxiety: Writing about Emotion in Modern History." *History Workshop Journal* 55 (2003): 111-133.

Bourke, Joanna. *Fear. A Cultural History*. London: Virago, 2005.

Friederike Brühöfener. 'Politics of Emotions. Journalistic Reflections on the Emotionality of the West German Peace Movement, 1979-1984.' *German Politics and Society*, 33, no. 4 (2015): 97-111.

Cook, Hera. "From Controlling Emotion to Expressing Feelings in Mid-Twentieth-Century England." *Journal of Social History* 47, no. 3 (2014): 627-646.

Dibley, Ben, and Michelle Kelly. "Morale and Mass Observation: Governing the Affective Atmosphere on the Home-Front." *Museum and Society* 13, no. 1 (2015): 22-41.

Gammerl, Benno. "Emotional Styles - Concepts and Challenges." *Rethinking History. The Journal of Theory and Practice* 16, no. 2 (2012): 161-75.

Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper and Francesca Polletta, eds. *Passionate Politics. Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Grant, Matthew. *After the Bomb. Civil Defence and Nuclear War in Britain, 1945-68*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Grant, Matthew. "Historicizing Citizenship in Post-war Britain." *Historical Journal* 59, no. 4 (2016): 1187-1206.

Harrison, Tom, and Charles Madge, eds. *War Begins at Home by Mass Observation*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1940.

Hassiotis, Loukianos. "British Military Opinion and Military Intervention in Greece, December 1944-January 1945: Stories from Mass-Observation." *Journal of Contemporary History* 50, no. 2 (2015): 296-317.

Hinton, James. "Middle-class Socialism: Selfhood, Democracy and Distinction in Wartime County Durham." *History Workshop Journal* 62 (2006): 116-141.

Hinton, James. *Nine Wartime Lives: Mass Observation and the Making of the Modern Self*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Hinton, James. *The Mass Observers. A History, 1937-1949*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Hogg, Jonathan, and Christoph Laucht. "British Nuclear Culture." *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45, no. 4 (2012).

Hogg, Jonathan. "'The Family that Feared Tomorrow': British Nuclear Culture and Individual Experience in the late 1950s." *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45, no. 4 (2012): 535-549.

Hogg, Jonathan. *British Nuclear Culture. Official and Unofficial Narratives in the Long 20th Century*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Hubble, Nick. *Mass Observation and Everyday Life: Culture, History, Theory*. London: Palgrave, 2006.

Hughes, Jeff. "What is British Nuclear Culture? Understanding *Uranium 235*." *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45, no. 4 (2012): 495-518.

Kushner, Tony. *We Europeans? Mass-Observation, Race and British Identity in the Twentieth Century*. London: Ashgate, 2004.

Langhamer, Claire, "The Live Dynamic Whole of Feeling and Behavior: Capital Punishment and the Politics of Emotion, 1945–1957." *Journal of British Studies* 51, no. 2 (2012): 416-441.

Langhamer, Claire. *The English in Love: The Intimate Story of an Emotional Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Langhamer, Claire. "'Who the hell are ordinary people?' Ordinariness as a category of historical analysis." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 28 (forthcoming 2018).

Laucht, Christoph "'Dawn – or Dusk?': Britain's *Picture Post* confronts Nuclear Energy." In *The Nuclear Age in Popular Media. A Transnational History, 1945-1965*, edited by Dick Van Lente, 117-148. London: Palgrave, 2012.

Madge, Charles, and Tom Harrisson. *Mass-Observation*. London: Frederick Muller, 1937.

Masco, Joseph. "'Survival is Your Business': Engineering Ruins and Affect in Nuclear America." *Cultural Anthropology* 23, no. 2 (2008): 361-398.

Mass Observation Archive. Directive. May 1940

Mass Observation Archive. Directive. August 1940.

Mass Observation Archive. File Report 1415. 'Mass-Observation'. 2nd September 1942.

Mass-Observation Archive. Directive Responses. December 1943.

Mass Observation Archive. Directive Responses. August 1945.

Mass Observation Archive. File Report 2278A. "August Newsletter 1945 from Mass-Observation."

Mass-Observation. *Peace and the Public. A Study by Mass-Observation*. London: Longmans, 1947.

Newcastle Journal, 12th May 1947. Clipping in Mass Observation Archive. 50/1/G.

Noakes, Lucy. *War and the British: Gender and National Identity 1939-91*. London: I. B. Tauris, 1998.

Noakes, Lucy, "Gender, Grief and Bereavement in Second World War Britain." *Journal of War and Culture Studies* 8, no. 1 (2015): 72-85.

Picture Post 28, no. 8, 25th August 1945.

Purcell, Jennifer. *Domestic Soldiers: Six Women's Lives in the Second World War*. London: Constable, 2010.

Reddy, William. "Historical Research on the Self and Emotions." *Emotion Review* 1, no. 4 (2009): 302-315.

Rose, Sonya O. *Which People's War: National Identity and Citizenship in Wartime Britain 1939-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Roseneil, Sasha. *Disarming Patriarchy: Feminism and Political Action at Greenham*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Emotional Communities in the Early Modern Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell Press, 2006.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Shapira, Michel. *The War Inside. Psychoanalysis, Total War, and the Making of the Democratic Self in Postwar Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.